

REMARKS

The continued requirement for more information and revised specification is respectfully traversed. The requirement for more information was based on the earlier addition of the C.I.P. statement in the preamble of the specification. That statement has now been removed. Accordingly, there is no proper legal justification for the request for an amended specification.

Even if the C.I.P. statement had been retained in the application, the requirement for a marked up copy of the specification would have been traversed. The present application was not written with slight modifications over the prior application. The present application was completely re-written from scratch. Accordingly, the marked up copy would not be useful, and would only show virtually the entire prior document deleted and virtually the entire present document added.

Although, the request for more information is improper, Applicants will offer a brief summary of some of the common points between the applications as a disclosure of information.

The prior application is relevant, because the title says “converting between data sets and XML documents.” The specification of the prior application discusses “annotated DTD’s” at length. “Annotated DTD’s” are a kind of annotated schema, per claim 1 & claim 6, though they are not used the same way in the prior application as in the claims of the present application. The prior application also deals in several place

REMARKS

with the XML electronic format recited in some of the claims of this application. The prior application discusses an electronic format that includes value pairs per claim 3; see e.g. p. 40, line 10 of the prior spec. Page 10, line 5 of the prior specification talks about using a single DTD for multiple heterogeneous data sources, e.g. at p. 10, line 4, per claim 7; cf claim 9 of the present application, which also relates to heterogeneous databases. The prior application discusses in several places using annotations for retrieving specifications for a desired document type from a first electronic format per claim 7 of the present application. Page 24, line 5 talks about the data sources being relational databases, per claim 50.


Similar limitations are found in many of the remaining claims of the present application -- as the Examiner has already noticed.

Applicants believe that an extension of time may be due under 37 CFR 1.136 (a). If any such extension of time fee is due, please charge the fee for this extension, but no other fee, to deposit account 50-1035.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully submit that they have addressed each issue raised by the Examiner — except for any that were skipped as moot — and that the application is accordingly in condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



By _____

Anne E. Barschall, Reg. No. 31,089

Tel. no. 914-332-1019

Fax no. 914-332-7719

Date of printing: March 6, 2007